

Public Comments

Custer State Park Airport Decommissioning

Matt Confer

Jackson WY

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please consider other alternatives rather than decommissioning such as finding cooperative partners like the Recreational Aviation Foundation that has grant money and volunteers to maintain airports such as Custer.

Recreational airports in other states have benefitted from successful public/private partnerships for preservation and maintenance.

Matt Confer

Dale Knuth

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose closing down the Custer State Park Airport.

This airport provides access to the park for individuals that travel from a fair distance away including myself. I disagree with the analysis of the airport as I have been there many times.

Derek Samson

Menasha WI

Position: oppose

Comment:

New pilot and love Custer. Is high on my list to fly into and camp in the state park. Please do not close it.

James Densmore

Colorado Springs CO

Position: support

Comment:

We do not get up that way often but loved the airport during our visit with our Skywagon convention in 2016 I think it was. We landed some 30 Skywagons there that day. These airports are an important resource, don't give it up!

Dianne Wieman

Marion TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

The airport at Custer state park is a wonderful place to land and great way to come visit the park. I did this and had a great stay

Greg Daughtry

Boulder CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am a pilot from Colorado who uses the Custer state park airstrip. This is a unique and valuable state resource that is rare and should be preserved. It is also an important emergency landing strip useful for emergencies when overflying and for staging for firefighting and SAR.

Please do not close the airport.

Thomas Aex

Salida CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

Our nation is in desperate need of pilots and leaders airstrips and airplanes create both!

Bronson Macdonald

Boulder CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not close this airfield. This is a historical airfield that provides so much to the general aviation community, from locally learning how to land on shorter, gravel airfields to a place for emergency landings for planes traveling through the state.

It also provides camping under your airplane wing. There are not many airfields that allow this and is cherished through the aviation community. It allows others that can not afford to stay at a hotel a place to stay. Ride their bike to town, explore and support the surrounding natural resources.

Please keep this open because we need to continue to have the US be unique with our support of the general aviation community.

Trevor Igel

Estes Park CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kathy Julien

Aptos CA

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not decommission this historical and wonderful little airfield.

Bruce Jennings

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The Custer State Park airport is an important travel asset for the park. The airport provides easy access for pilots who wish to visit, and an important emergency landing area for those transiting the area. As compared to other access methods, the airport is relatively inexpensive to maintain and removes traffic from otherwise busy roadways. If runway surface maintenance is an issue, the commission should consider reverting the runway to grass.

Resources are available to assist with maintenance and improvement at the airport. Utilization would increase with better facilities. The Recreational Aircraft Foundation is an excellent resource with a proven track record to assist with maintenance and improvement.

I have personally landed at the park airport several times. GFP staff comments as to the lesser utility of a grass runway are ill informed. South Dakota pilots of a wide variety of aircraft operate off grass runways on a daily basis.

Jim Hadorn

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the decommissioning of the Custer State Park airport:

1. Safety - unattended facility potential for damage to surrounding environment (fire, fuel spill or accident)
2. Monies- 2.5 to 3 million could be better allocated to other park upgrades to benefit all of the visitors and provide a richer environmental impact. The continued monies for fence upgrades and runway improvements would be constant drain on park resources.
3. Vision - what future needs does the park need to sustain its rich beauty for all visitors to enjoy, please move past the issue of a frequently used outdated airport and look towards future needs of Custer State Park.

Cathy Page

Tucson AZ

Position: oppose

Comment:

A gem that I still want to be able to access and experience. Instead of decommissioning, invite the pilots of SD and other regions to help keep it maintained. They can be of great help.

Joette Felice

Lewiston NY

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

S Salt

Boulder CO

Position: support

Comment:

PLEASE close the strip! GA flies leaded fuel on top of its noise disruption. I am so proud of SD for moving this direction. Camping and hiking will also monumentally improve. We don't go to remote places to hear an aviation amusement park.

Donna Urban

Centennial CO

Position: support

Comment:

Planes flying in to an area where hunters and fishermen are?! No way. These planes need to STAY AWAY from places like this!

Gary Keller

The Villages FL

Position: support

Comment:

A taxpayer driven airstrip to keep open for a few of the 1/4 of 1% group known as pilots. Stop this lead and noise polluting group from their continued destruction of parks with their damaging hobby at the expense of to rest of us.

Dean Hendrickson

Lake George CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

Why would anyone try to close a perfectly good airport that so many people enjoy using and camping at?

Robert Duncan

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Having been in aviation for over 40 years I strongly recommend against any airport closing. Instead of closing you should be promoting it as another opportunity to enjoy Custer State Park. You could start by removing the roofless hangar, installing aircraft parking and tie down area. Install a nice restroom or vault toilet, have a direct line to the State Game Lodge. Pilots and passengers would surely pay for a ride to have breakfast, lunch or dinner. Pilots are notoriously good tippers so maybe a Safari Jeep could be used for transportation. There are endless ways to get this airport better utilized. One thing is for sure if you let this airport go, you will never have another chance to replace it. In this day and age nothing gets accomplished that doesn't draw a bunch of criticism. If a fire should occur in the vicinity, you will thank your lucky stars you still have this airport.

Terry Hinn

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It would be a travesty to close that airport, just out of curiosity, how do you know what the transit traffic is if no one mans it?? I use it probably 8-10 times a year meeting family and friends on the wild life loop, and use it as a friend lives near-by. Gov Noem talks of the HUGE surplus she has created, funding should of came for this a long, long time ago before it got to the condition it is in now. and I do believe the local volunteer fire service used it to refill the single engine tankers during the CSP fire a couple years ago.

Duane Kraft

Timber Lake SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not close this airport. I have numerous aircraft registered in the state. With a little work the Custer state airport could be a gem for tourism for the beautiful Black Hills.

Jeffrey Russell

Waunakee WI

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose closing the Custer State Park Airport. Reports of the poor runway condition are greatly overstated. Just this last weekend, participants from fly-in held in Hot Springs flew to the airport and marveled at the beauty of the area. All commented that the runway condition was completely fine. In the future, if and when the runway may degrade, it would be possible to grind up the existing asphalt and create a gravel runway.

The Custer State Park airport represents a fantastic recreational destination and provides access to many recreational activities within the park. Closing this airport would not be in the best public interest.

Christopher Lang

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This airport is a valuable asset to the airmen of SD. I believe it is necessary for Park utilization by airmen of all the surrounding states. It is a necessary alternate to the glider pilots of the Black Hills Soaring Club. I am one of those pilots. When traversing the Black Hills westbound in glider cross country flights, it is important to have airports as alternate /emergency landable options if winds and weather become an issue during glider cross country flights. The same can be said of Hot Air balloons and their pilots in this state. Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Michael Marshall

Greeley CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

These airports are both historical and functional! Stop screwing up our historical aviation icons!

Patrick Hiles

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I've been utilizing the CSP airport for over 18 years. In the national guard we use this airport almost daily to train with our Black Hawk helicopters ensuring we are always mission ready. The types of training we do there are not feasible at the busier local airports and the amount of noise complaints would increase dramatically if CSP were to be decommissioned. In my off time, I've spent many nights under the wing of my Cessna 170 camping with my two children. Recreational aviation is growing rapidly and this is one of the only airports available in the Black Hills that supports that kind of flying. The article I read said that it is rarely utilized, but I've seen many small aircraft camping at the airport but without a sign in sheet, there is no real way to track usage. Decommissioning this airport would have a detrimental impact on the National Guard training, local general aviation, and would no longer draw pilots from outside our area looking for a place to fly-in camp.

Barry Sullivan

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This field is one of the most used airports for training of military and recreational flyers in the black hills. It is also extremely useful for EMS use in that area when needed in an emergency.

Jim Hayward

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Several members in our EAA Chapter 39 have used this airport over the past several decades. It makes a great practice area for pilots desiring to practice pattern work without bothering Rapid City Regional with the practice. The shorter area also allows quicker pattern work and when the winds are up it's a great location for crosswind pattern practice. I personally have used it quite often and have seen radio control aircraft folks utilizing the parking area for their planes. The last time I was there a few months ago, the runway didn't seem to be that bad and is better than a lot of rural fields in the state.

Morgan Post

Council Bluffs IA

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the decommissioning of the Custer State Park airport. The airport provides a unique opportunity to directly access a beautiful area. Airplane camping is a growing segment of the flying community that would utilize the airport without upgrades. I believe the state should explore other options, such as converting the runway to grass, before deciding to close the airport. Nonprofit organizations such as the Recreational Aviation Foundation use volunteers to rehabilitate and preserve airstrips for future generations to use. The closure of the Custer State Park airport would be a major loss to the aviation community and should be prevented.

Matthew Retka

West Fargo ND

Position: oppose

Comment:

I remember flying into this airport and camping with dad as a kid. What a great way to explore Custer State Park it was.

I can appreciate the potential burden to the Commission to keep it open, but encourage you to explore cooperative alternatives to preserve this recreational asset. For example, the Recreational Aviation Foundation has grant money and volunteers for projects that qualify. I wish my home state of ND had more places like this.

Edward Decastro

Laramie WY

Position: support

Comment:

As recreational aviation continues to grow, airports in back country and suburban areas become more valuable. I am confident that organizations such as the RAF will provide valuable support if allowed so as to keep this airport open. Please explore possible cooperative efforts with the RAF in order to keep the Custer airport. Thank you for your efforts to do so.

Dave Tunge

Yankton SD

Position: support

Comment:

Custer State Park is unique in that it has an airport. Few parks do. It provides camping within walking distance to facilities yet offers a degree of remoteness for those who want to camp away from the crowds. It also provides a back up airport for Custer. Let's give this decision some time.....visit with the Recreational Aviation Foundation (RAF) regarding options available. The park has this unique attraction we should not lose.

Kristi Dunks

Bozeman MT

Position: oppose

Comment:

I wish to go on record as supporting the preservation of Custer State Park Airport, 3V0. Recreational aviation is a large and important segment of the general aviation industry and airports such as Custer State Park Airport are a critical part of recreational aviation operations. With a 4,000-foot long runway, this airport also serves as an important landing option for aircraft operating in South Dakota. I understand the work and funding that it takes to maintain this type of airport, but many states have looked toward public and private partnerships to maintain the airport partnering with groups such as the Recreational Aviation Foundation. Custer State Park Airport provides dispersed access to the park, and reduces congestion at nearby Custer County Airport, while remaining feasible for firefighting, search and rescue, and life-flight missions. Airports like Custer State Park provide valuable transportation infrastructure to the west and I hope that you will explore alternative options before closing the airport. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Bryce Dibbern

Interior SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please keep this airport operational! It is my family's favorite place to fly and camp!

Darrel W Sauder

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Used by a variety of aircraft as recreational opportunity. If cost of maintenance is a problem.. remove asphalt and make it a grass strip. RAF volunteers will contribute to maintenance and grants to keep it open.

Michael Perkins

Bigfork MT

Position: oppose

Comment:

Consider alternatives to the decommissioning of Custer State Park Airport. There are many alternatives for funding. The airport offers a trailhead for recreational enthusiasts and is unique in South Dakota. In addition, it can be used as a forward operating base for fire fighting operations and training for military.

Robert Guilfoyle

Shepherd MT

Position: oppose

Comment:

WE LOVE SOUTH DAKOTA !

My wife and I always look forward with excited anticipation to our flights to Custer State Park that we try to make every late Spring and early-mid Fall . We are older folks that can't tolerate long automobile trips due to our working class spinal arthritis. Flying cuts many of our road trips almost in half .

We have often said to each other that if we were to ever leave our home state of Montana , our ONLY choice would be South Dakota .

We would be heartbroken if we could no longer fly into CSP . I can confidently say that there are many others from MT , WY , SD , NB that we have visited with during our flights to CSP that would feel likewise .

Randy Van Winkle

Van Buren MO

Position: support

Comment:

I urge the Commission to please explore any and all avenues to keep this airport open. This is a true asset for everyone, not only aviation enthusiasts, but the service it provides for fire fighting activities and safety options for general public emergencies . Please keep this airport open at all costs because if lost we all lose much more than just a 4,000' strip of land. Please continue to keep South Dakota great !

Craig Baumiller

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This airport could be used as a recreation area with camping. Come fly in and tent in the most beautiful place on earth Custer state park. This airport could be utilized for so many missions. Please consider keeping it and making it a fly in destination. Thank you Craig

David Utter

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This airport is one of my favorite places. It provides recreational opportunities to many. We should keep it open.

Shashi Kanth

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a great training resource PLUS a great emergency landing option in the terrain surrounding. An absolute gem of a back country airport. Encourage general aviation flying, with advertising, for local sight seeing by air, host local fly ins and young eagle events, pretty soon it will blossom into a thriving economic opportunity. Please don't shut this down.

Colleen Venner

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My husband and I own and manage a private chartered airport, Black Hills Flyway SD27, 7 miles south of Hot Springs. We created an airpark and had all lots sold within 90 days by word of mouth. Two of us have completed our build, and five are in the process.

We just took part in an annual flyin where 89 planes were hosted at the Hot Springs airport for four days and tent camped. We hosted an ice cream social at our airport, and 35 planes attended.

We would be happy to visit at length about the possibilities of the airport at Custer State Park. We believe it should grow, not close. We believe with the right management this could help both tourism and aviation in the state. Please see provided photo of our social fly in.

Carmine Mowbray

Polson MT

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please consider the Recreational Aviation Foundation resources in your consideration of this valuable recreational asset. The RAF provides grants and experienced volunteers that work under the direction of Land Managers to preserve places like this.

Please consider allowing the airfield to return to turf, thus saving the expense of asphalt maintenance. Your state recreational use statute protects the Fish and Game Commission, as well.

Thank you for doing all you can to preserve this asset for public use.

Free Park Entrance and Fishing

Kerry Stiner

Burke SD

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly support the elimination of Mothers and Fathers Day free fishing weekends.

Mountain Lion Season - Expanded Use of Hounds

Dana Rogers

Hill City SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the expanded use of hounds in pursuit of Mt Lions in the BHNF. I'd like to see the petition crafted differently through GFP staff though. Perhaps a 20% of the total quota and a start date about March 1st. To allow the hard charging boot trackers plenty of time to keep pursuing their opportunities. We need more Lions taken to help reduce predation on our BH Big Game populations.

Kim Gennaro

Hubbard OH

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cody Johnson

Belle Fourche SD

Position: support

Comment:

As a rancher and a hunter in the black hills I support the use of hounds in the black hills. The use of hounds is the most effective and ethical way to control and manage a population of mountain lions. In the Wyoming black hills they use hounds and they don't have issues, they do however kill much more mature lions. The use of hounds enables hunters to selectively kill the necessary lions to grow a population. Houndsmen are the single greatest tool a department can use to keep population numbers within the desired number.

Jeremy Wells

Sturgis SD

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly support the use of hounds in the black hills for the better management of a very healthy lion population. The opportunities this would open up for all hunters way beyond just lion hunting. One lion will kill an average of a deer every 7 days! That's 52 deer a year ! We have a declining elk deer and especially Mt goat population. We need hounds as its been a very productive tool in Custer state park!

Leisa Bailey

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brennan Welbig

Montrose SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the use of Mt. Lion hunting with use of hounds in the Hill with current information around the proposal and population data from the state.

If lion population numbers are in the desired/targeted range, then logically there is no NEED for another method of hunting them. This is to say, the current method is achieving the target population. Again, that is assuming the data is accurate. It seems there are too many potential variables which may come into play and cannot be easily predicted if the use of hounds is allowed (as currently proposed)—private land conflicts, commercialization (guiding), inexperienced houndsmen (or any Joe Smith taking their dog out), conflicts with boot hunters (such as pursuing the same lion), treeing for sport/practice (or not harvesting lion when treed), and possibly more. I believe with really knowing what may happen if this goes through, we are taking a huge risk just to satisfy the WANT of a small group. The risk outweighs the reward. I understand the want for houndsmen to have the ability to run their dogs in the Hills. However, I may want to hunt deer with a crossbow. I may want to hunt lions in November. But you are not going to satisfy everyone, and that's a fact. You allow 12 lions this year, next year some will want 18. Next year, nonresidents will want in. The fact is that there is no need for it at this point in time, according to the data.

Now, if that data may not be completely accurate or lion harvest limits are going down, then it may be time to start talking about using hounds to assist. Obviously, there would need to be regulations around it. Here are just a few ideas which have been brought up in other discussions:

- Use of hounds allowed if certain number of harvested lions not reached by April (40-50?). I think a specific season date for hounds would be best so it's not a free for all throughout the whole season.
- Requirement to harvest treed lion if harvest limit allows (certain number of males and females)
- Report to state if you will be hunting with hounds and any applicable info (year's experience, dog breed, any other qualifications)
- Not able to pursue lion if boot tracks also found
- Residents only

If a hound season is passed, it needs to start off on its own season dates and not throughout the entire season, at least starting off. I think there are too many uncontrollables at this point. That way, we can see how the first run goes and discuss from there. It is much easier to give than it is to take away (see new deer tag system – haha).

With all that said, I strongly oppose a Mt. Lion hound season in the Hills only to satisfy a few, especially when current data says populations could potentially fall outside of the target range if harvest limits are reached each year. I do not oppose hunting lions with hounds in general. I think it is great for people who choose to do so. I just think the opportunity to hunt lions on foot in the Hills is very unique and special, along with the hunters who do it—something I think no other state with similar habitats can claim. I'd hate to see it fall apart for no factual reasons.

Brian Hansen

Bath SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Seth Mulvehill

Piedmont SD

Position: support

Comment:

As I've stated before, a more precise and efficient tool to potentially be used to aid in rebounding our falling big game numbers seems like a no-brainer. And the small tag allotment will have little to no intrusion on current "boot" hunting enthusiasts, myself included.

Sam Huffman

Belle Fourche SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jon Peterson

Belle Fourche SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sarah Johnson

Belle Fourche SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support mountain lion hunting with hounds in the black hills. Selective hunting is far more ethical than the current style of lion hunting in the black hills. The "boot hunters" kill young lions and a massive majority of them are females. Often spotted lions under 50 lbs are killed by these boot hunters. Let's put a stop to the killing of small, young lions and let's manage our population ethically and humanely, with hounds.

Penny Schneeman

Gillette WY

Position: support

Comment:

Mountain Lions can be very dangerous. Hunting with hounds evens the odds of a successful hunt.

Norman Burleson

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Hello, there are a lot of my friends and I that are strongly against hunting lions with dogs outside of Custer State Park in the Black Hills fire protection district. They will dominate the hunting of them. We will no longer purchase tags if it goes through. Thank You, Norm Burleson.

Nonresident One-Day Fishing License

Kerry Stiner

Burke SD

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly support elimination of the one day fishing license as well as elimination of the free Mothers and Fathers day fishing weekends. We use North Point often and I think there are more out of state vehicles than SD vehicles. I also see them bring their \$90,000 boats and \$100,000 pickups so I don't think a few extra dollars for licenses is going to affect anybody.

Todd Martell

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

A one-day fishing license for friends and family that may not be dedicated fisherman is a necessity, \$62 for one day of fishing with a three day license and habitat fee will cause people to not participate, a slight increase in the cost of a one day license would be more appropriate.

Dennis Block

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The one-day non-resident proposal is, in my opinions, asinine! Who in their right mind would purchase a 3 day license for \$62!?! I fished in Wisconsin a couple of weeks ago, and purchased an ANNUAL Wisconsin license for roughly \$28! I'm very hsrp-pressed to believe that the GGP will have a positive impact of \$500,000 - 1.3 million! Who's kidding who here?! This sounds like Iowa who set up cameras on I-29 to photograph speeders, to help pay for their road construction! If I was a non-resident, I wouldn't come to S.D. to fish! Did any "dound-minded" legislators check surrounding States to compare licese fees for non-residents?

Apparently, legislators didn't figure in the cost of not only a license, but cost of gas, boat rental, motel/hotel fees, food, entertainment, purchase of fishing gear/essentials, etc.!! This is purely for economic means, not for a non-resident to bring himself or family to enjoy the great things this State has to offer! Wonder what/who resort/motel/hotel owners will blame when their business income falls short of their expectations....and hopes!

David Hempel

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My family all lives out of state and come back to fish two weekends a year (Fathers Day & Labor Day). This involves 8 individuals who fish one day each of the weekends. It is like none of them will purchase a \$62 license each time the fish for one day so this essentially eliminates a family tradition that we have enjoyed for the past 10 years. I purchase an annual resident fishing license every year, but find myself now reconsidering whether I want to even do continue doing that since this change would penalize my family to that extent. My lids do not pull in with \$40,000 boats & \$60,000 pickups. They are simple "bobber" fisher people who are fishing for the relaxation of the family time together. I hope you reconsider this move.

Sincerely,

David Hempel

Paul Johnson

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We have a large number of fishermen that come only once a year and prefer the one day licensing option. This could also deter new fishermen giving the sport a try because of too large of an investment. The revenue created for us with the sale of one day licenses helps to off set the minimal amount we collect on the annual license which is used up credit card charges. We do understand the need for the habitat stamp revenue, but taking away options for sportsmen will not create good public relations, most of which your licensing agents absorb and defend.

Paul and Karen Johnson

Lynn Lake Lodge

Other

Patrick Ginsbach

Hot Springs SD

Position: other

Comment:

Roeber Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. I went to access them on your website, and the response was, "Page cannot be found". Why not. And to try and contact your agency is impossible. Where is your general website email address? Get your act together. Answer my question, and please email me a copy of the Roeber Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Patrick Ginsbach

Trout Spearing

Steven Gottfredson

Salt Lake City UT

Position: support

Comment:

I support the new trout spearing proposal. Trout are VERY difficult to spear and I suspect fewer than 10 trout per year will be harvested due to this regulation. However, spearfishing is growing in popularity as a sustainable way to get tasty fish. Opening access like this is important.

Ben Schutt

Oshkosh SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Adam Laehn

Minneapolis MN

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Gary Haag

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a long-time member of the Black Hills Flyfishers I support their position which is as follows; "The proposed regulation conflicts with our advocacy of sustainable fisheries and access for all anglers. Spearing will decrease the number of large rainbow trout in the Black Hills Fisheries Management Area available to hook and line anglers and provides an unnecessary advantage to the diver. This may also lead to unintended or malicious harvest of additional trout species (brown, brook, tiger, cutthroat, lake). Divers and their gear will impede hook and line angling opportunities, both from shore or by boat, in and around important fishing access locations. Elderly and disabled anglers will be without access to shore fishing opportunities when divers are occupying their favorite locations. We also have questions pertaining to which bodies of water will be openly available to spearing (i.e. Pactola afterbay, small black hills dams, etc.). We believe this regulation will be detrimental to the Black Hills Fisheries Management Area and should not be adopted by the commission."

Thank you for the chance to comment.

Gary Haag

Hot Springs, SD

Tim Bjork

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I adamantly oppose this proposal. We don't need any more pressure on our water and fishery resources, renewable or not. The argument that this is a put and take fishery is disingenuous in that taking as many stocked fish as possible doesn't seem to be a positive management philosophy. Thank you for taking the time to listen to the public.